DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 475 LI 002 094

AUTHOR	Knapp, Patricia B.
TITLE	The Library, the Undergraduate and the Teaching Faculty.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., San Diego. University Library.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	50p.; Paper prepared for the Institute on Training for Service in Undergraduate Libraries..., August 17-21, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.60
DESCRIPTORS	*College Libraries, Curriculum, Faculty, *Librarians, *Library Education, *Library Services, *Objectives, Students, Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Undergraduate Libraries

ABSTRACT

The faculty, the students, the curriculum, the university as an organization and the university library as a total system are powerful forces in determining the role of the undergraduate library. Thus, if the undergraduate library is going to provide active library service in collaboration with the teaching faculty, librarians must understand how these powerful outside elements operate. Each of the elements of the academic milieu is considered with respect to its effect on the undergraduate library. Recommendations for using this information as a positive contribution to the development of an active campaign to achieve the ideal of the undergraduate library as a teaching instrument are included. (NH)

ED042475

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Institute on

TRAINING FOR SERVICE IN UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARIES

sponsored by
The University Library
University of California, San Diego*

August 17-21, 1970

THE LIBRARY, THE UNDERGRADUATE AND THE TEACHING FACULTY

by

Patricia B. Knapp
Associate Professor, Department of Library Science
Wayne State University

LI 002094

*Conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Title II-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, P. L. 89-329, as amended.

THE LIBRARY, THE UNDERGRADUATE AND THE TEACHING FACULTY

Introduction

This paper presents a view not of but from the undergraduate library. It looks outward--toward the faculty, the students, and the curriculum and also toward the university as an organization and toward the university library as a total system. These elements of the academic milieu are powerful forces in determining the role of the undergraduate library, and if that library is to go beyond providing "self-service capability"--which it has been remarkably successful in doing --to active library service in collaboration with the teaching faculty, librarians must understand how these powerful outside elements operate.

For those who aspire to this ideal of active library service, the prospect presented here is gloomy. For within each of the major segments of the academic milieu there is, it seems to me, a major thrust which runs counter to such an ideal goal. In the faculty there is an increasing trend toward "professionalization of the disciplines." Among the students, "making the grade" is an overriding influence and the "vocational subculture" is dominant. The undergraduate curriculum, lacking a unified and coherent philosophical foundation, ends up as a compromise among the various conflicting views of its purpose. As a

"professionally-oriented organization" the university is fragmented and dominated by competing graduate and research interests. And, finally, the university library system is necessarily organized in an hierarchial fashion, which is out of tune with the pattern of the university organization itself; it is subject to the power of the research-oriented establishment; and its operational patterns are ill-suited to the mass requirements of undergraduate library service.

Despite the grimness of this general picture, however, I do not intend to discourage the undergraduate librarian who wants a more active role in serving undergraduate education. Instead, I hope, first, to provide a dose of realism as an antidote to the sort of over-optimism which usually leads ultimately to too-ready acceptance of defeat and, second, to point out a few bright spots in the general gloom--some minority tendencies in the clientele, some hopeful indications of change, some tactics which may be useful.

The analysis presented here is derived from reading, from observation, and from some participation in undergraduate teaching and administration. It consists mostly of personal reflections, and because it is personal, I must warn you that my bent is toward the social sciences. Like many in this field I am given to rather large generalizations. These should not be understood as anything on the order of scientific principles based on irrefutable evidence but simply as ways of looking at social phenomena and of trying to find some rational order in their complexity.

Another caveat is in order before we move into discussion, first, of the faculty. Most of the sources of information I have used are based on evidence gathered prior to 1968--most, in fact, are based on studies conducted in the late 50's and early 60's. It is impossible to predict whether the increasing ferment in the universities during the past two years, the financial strain, the student unrest, the internal and external pressures toward social involvement and politicization--whether all these will produce significant changes. If they do, they may make the picture of the university presented here obsolete and the prospects for library service to undergraduate education will be a good deal better than they seem to be now. For some of the bright spots in the picture are embodied in the reforms in curriculum and in governance now being called for. But the odds are heavy against major reforms in the near future. All institutions have a tremendous capacity for resistance to change--the bigger the institution the greater that capacity. Moreover, education, particularly higher education, is notoriously conservative. Still, my view is from the far side of the generation gap and I may be unduly pessimistic about what the student radicals and reformers can accomplish.

The Faculty

Professionalization of the disciplines.--The overriding characteristic of faculty society, as indicated above, is the increasing professionalization of the disciplines, for which Jencks and Riesman provide

such abundant evidence in their book, The Academic Revolution.[1] Briefly, what professionalization of the disciplines means is that faculty members more and more identify with their field of study rather than with the institution in which they teach. They are cosmopolitan in the sense that they look to their peers in the disciplines for standards of behavior and achievement, for recognition and rewards, and for communication, the feeling of belonging, of talking the same language.

This one major characteristic of the faculty affects the undergraduate library in a number of ways. First, and most obviously, because recognition in the discipline comes almost exclusively as a result of research and publication, it feeds the ever-growing research orientation of the university and devalues proportionately teaching in general and undergraduate teaching in particular.

Second, because the faculty seem to think of achievement in a discipline as virtually equivalent of success in a career, it reinforces an increasing vocationalism and decreasing non-conformist (or independent) intellectualism in the student culture.

Third, it strengthens the department as a power base in the university structure, thus contributing to the fragmentation of centralized power in the university and to the consequent dispersion and weakening of support for centralized programs such as the undergraduate curriculum and for centralized facilities such as the undergraduate library.

And fourth, it underlines the typical professional view of the administration, including the library, as a bureaucracy which is, at best, efficient and unobstrusive or, at worst, a monolithic tyranny to be resisted at almost any cost.

These four aspects of the professionalization of the faculty, thus are clearly related to aspects of the other elements in the academic scene, also with mostly negative implications for the undergraduate library, which are to be considered later on.

But a more positive implication is also at least a possibility. To the extent that identification with a discipline includes acceptance of a common language, a common style of work, and common patterns of communication, understanding of these aspects of the several disciplines may give librarians clues which could open the way to better relationship with the faculty who work in them.

This is to suggest not that the undergraduate library should be staffed with subject specialists, but rather that all academic librarians and undergraduate librarians in particular, should be especially alert and sensitive to similarities and differences among the disciplines which may have an effect on teaching objectives and methods and on the role of library resources and services in both teaching and in the discipline itself.

Let me state a few generalizations to illustrate my point. (First, though, I should repeat my earlier warning that these are personal

opinions derived from limited experience.):

General faculty attitudes.--Most faculty members in all disciplines place a high value on "knowing one's subject" and share a corresponding lack of interest in teaching methodology and a common contempt for the "educationists"--a dirty word--who are concerned about learning theory, teaching strategy, behavioral outcomes and the like. Implication: librarians should underplay whatever theoretical expertise they may have in these matters. They should be cautious about too obvious alliances with instructional technologists, media specialists, and so on.

Nevertheless, and despite any disciplinary orientation, most of the faculty are sincerely concerned about their teaching effectiveness. They may be receptive to suggestions and help from the librarian, if they are persuaded that the librarian really understands their objectives --what they are driving at--and really has concrete information about students' learning behavior.

Also across disciplines, the faculty share a limited perception of what real understanding and skill in the use of library resources means. In varying degrees, depending on the discipline, they have achieved considerable mastery of the literature of their own respective fields. Below that, at what might be called a general education level of competence, they perceive nothing more complicated or demanding than what is taught in a good high school. Perhaps they are right in

this perception, for certainly most library orientation and instruction programs in college duplicate what is covered in good high school programs, merely adding more tools or substituting more scholarly ones.

The implication, then, is that unless librarians can identify the concepts involved in sophisticated use of the library, something above the level of high school or common-sense skills but below the level of the subject specialist's grasp of a particular literature, they will never get much support from the faculty for attempts to provide students with the instruction they seem to need so much.

Blackburn points to certain other attitudes shared by the faculty across disciplines which might also be pertinent here. Librarians, he says, make the faculty feel guilty for failing to get students to use the library and feel humiliated at their own lack of ability to locate materials quickly.[2] This insight underlines the need for tact in presenting the case for or demonstrating the utility of college-level library competence.

Differences among the disciplines.--A strategy for achieving a working relationship with the teaching faculty calls for understanding, also, of the differences among the several disciplines. If we understand these differences we may be able to decide which fields offer most promise, which faculties should be cultivated. To this end, let me present some notions that might be worth exploring.

If we consider the extent to which each discipline is empirical, in the narrow sense of using data derived from direct observation in a

laboratory, through a telescope, in society or "the field," we get one measure of the role of the library in research. At one end of such a scale, the library has little or nothing to contribute to the empirical sciences; at the other end, it is the primary source of "raw" data for the non-empirical fields of literature and history; and in between, it contributes raw and or codified data for semi-empirical or hybrid disciplines such as economics and political science.

Similarly, if we consider the extent to which each discipline is cumulative, with each new discovery building on what has gone before, we get another measure. The cumulative natural sciences depend on the library for information which enables them to build on the work of the past and avoid duplication of effort; for the non-cumulative humanities this library function is much less crucial; and the social sciences again fall somewhere in the middle, since among them there are various overlapping styles of inquiry and each tends to develop new approaches and new evidence dealing with old questions.[3]

A third dimension worth considering might be the extent to which bibliographical expertise in the literature of a field is considered an essential part of the equipment of the professional working in it and is therefore typically required in graduate training. This factor might give us some clue as to the degree to which we might expect the faculty member in a given field to respect the librarian's bibliographical competence in comparison to his own. It is my impression that it explains, for

example, the frequent reluctance of the English and history departments to collaborate wholeheartedly in library instructional programs.[4]

And finally, the undergraduate librarian should be particularly concerned with differences among the disciplines with respect to their educational goals and the extent of their interest in students. One study of an "Eastern University with a large and distinguished undergraduate program,"[5] classifies disciplines on their tendencies to stress goals which are "technical" (i.e., proficiency), "moral" (i.e., commitment, values, breadth) and "mixed" (i.e., a little of both) and on whether their interest in students is "high," "medium," or "low." In the resulting two-dimensional, nine-box chart, librarians might well look for allies in those disciplines which express a high interest in students. The significance of the goal categories is not so clear, since library competence might be involved in any or all of them. It seems reasonable to assume, nevertheless, that where library competence is viewed as an important component in technical proficiency, the discipline will wish to maintain control over it and thus be reluctant to collaborate with non-specialist librarians. But where library competence is thought of as a desirable liberalizing attribute of the educated man, the disciplines which stress the "moral" goals are likely to be more amenable to such collaboration.

These four ways of looking at differences among the disciplines can be summarized in the following tentative propositions:

First, the potential contribution of the library is likely to be most clearly recognized in those non-empirical disciplines for which it is a source of "raw" or codified data: literature, history, political science, economics, and, to some extent sociology--and in those cumulative disciplines for which it supplies the essential record of past and present research: all the natural sciences, and, to a much lesser extent, all of the social sciences.

Second, the greatest potential for collaboration between non-specialist librarians and teaching faculty for the development of library competence in students lies in those disciplines which do not stress bibliographical training as a part of their own advanced or graduate work: the humanities, except literature, the social sciences, except history and psychology--and in the disciplines which express "medium" or "high" interest in students and, at the same time, are oriented toward "moral" and "mixed" goals: as reported these are--(high-moral) economics, history, and fine arts; (high-mixed) geology and social relations; (medium-moral) classics and government; (medium-mixed) biology, anthropology and English.[6]

Recognizing the fact that this kind of analysis can be applied only in the most grossly general sense, that individual faculty members may differ markedly from their colleagues, and that a kindred spirit is a kindred spirit wherever you find him, we might nevertheless conclude from all this that it might be worthwhile for librarians to cultivate faculty

members who work in those fields which have a fairly high composite ranking on these four dimensions, namely economics, political science, and the less field-work oriented branches of sociology.

The Student Culture

The GPA perspective.--Turning now to the students, let me begin with a quotation from Making the Grade, by Becker, Geer, and Hughes. Describing the attitudes and behavior of undergraduate students with respect to the academic side of college life as characterized by a grade point average (GPA) perspective, the authors describe this perspective as follows:

> The GPA perspective takes the rules made by faculty and administration about academic work as the basic reality with which a student must deal. It accepts as the definition of what is important the judgments handed down unilaterally from above and, in so doing, accepts the relationship of subjection between students and University without question. It accepts, of course, the definition embodied in college practice--the definition that makes grades the measure of academic achievement--and not various other definitions offered by University spokesmen from time to time which are not embodied in authoritative practice.
>
> Given this definition of what is important, the GPA perspective indicates various actions appropriate for students: seeking information, working hard, attempting to manipulate faculty in order to get a better grade, organizing for collective action to improve chances of getting a good grade, allocating effort in such a way as to maximize the over-all GPA, and so on. In short, students do what they calculate will best enable them to make the grade in what the institutions proffers as the only impersonal, objective, and formally recognized way of making that assessment.[7]

The major point for librarians is in that last sentence. Students will use the library if "they calculate that [doing so] will enable them to

make the grade." The obvious implication is that if librarians want to reach the vast majority of undergraduate students, they must work with and through the teaching faculty to ensure that use of the library is a required, essential component in course work.

If, moreover, librarians want the library to play a significant educational role in the experience of this majority, if they are not satisfied with merely dispensing required reading, they must try to work out library-related course assignments which call for really complex, really demanding ways of exploiting the organized body of library resources. For the GPA perspective does not mean that students are invariably stimulated to do all the work they can to get good grades. Let me quote again:

> In balancing their responsibilities, obligations, and opportunities, students do not underestimate the importance of academic work. They understand and take into account that some minimal level of academic performance is necessary before rewards can be sought in other areas. But they sometimes decide--and this is where their views diverge most from those of the faculty--that they will settle for a lower level of academic achievement than they could expect if they devoted all their effort to academic work, choosing instead to pursue other rewards they also consider important.[8]

Student sub-cultures.--Another way of looking at the student clientele is in terms of its sub-cultural groupings. One such typology, developed by Martin Trow and Burton Clark, distinguishes among four types, labelled academic, non-conformist, collegiate and vocational.

> These four categories are generated by the combination of two variables: the degree to which students are involved with ideas (much or

little), and the extent to which students identify with their college (much or little).

> The students in both the academic and non-conformist subcultures are very much interested in ideas, but members of the former group are highly identified with their college while the latter are not. . . . Members of the academic subculture identify with the concerns of faculty about their course work outside of class. There is an attachment to their school as an institution that supports intellectual values and opportunities for learning. On the other hand, the distinctive quality of members of the nonconformist subculture is a rather aggressive non-conformism, a critical detachment from the college they attend and from its faculty, and a generalized hostility to the administration. . . .
>
> The students in the other two subcultures--collegiate and vocational--are not particularly involved with ideas. Students in the collegiate subculture, while strongly attached and loyal to their college are resistant or indifferent to serious intellectual demands. Their values and activities focus on social life and extra-curricular activities. Students in the vocational subculture are neither intellectually oriented nor particularly attached to or generally involved in their college, which they view as off-the-job training. College is regarded as an organization of courses and credits leading to a diploma and a better job than they could otherwise command.[9]

In considering the implications for our purposes here, of this sort of analysis, we must first note that the undergraduate library is almost exclusively a phenomenon of the very large graduate and research-oriented university. In such a context, we would expect to find that: 1) the collegiate sub-culture is on the wane and that, in any case, the library would find it hard to reach; 2) the vocational sub-culture predominates, but that with increasing professionalization of the disciplines and a consequent emphasis on graduate work, the academic sub-culture is also strong; and 3) both the academic and the vocational sub-cultures are especially responsive to course and faculty demands, especially concerned with achievement as measured by grades; the former because

they genuinely accept the standards of the faculty, the latter because they see adequate grades as necessary credentials to be gathered for eventual certification for a job.

The earlier point about working through the faculty applies to both groups. (Undergraduate librarians should be aware, however, of the possibility that some students in both of these groups, but particularly in the academic sub-culture, may develop an early attachment to the departmental libraries, if there are such, which serve their respective majors.)

One final point: The non-conformist sub-culture is a small but interesting and, perhaps, growing minority. Because of its intellectual and aesthetic bent, and because it is less subject to the GPA perspective, the library might well decide that it is the one sub-culture worth courting directly.

The student protest movement.--The lag between research and the actual course of events is nowhere so apparent as in discussion of the student culture. The student protest movement has moved so rapidly, changing direction as it goes, now breaking into factions, later coalescing as a result of dramatic and tragic events, that it is almost impossible to keep up with. In the process it has stimulated floods of print, some few examples of careful and objective analysis, and only a very little empirical research. It has met with more success in its attempt to change the university than one would have thought possible ten years

ago, and yet the final outcome of the movement is certainly in doubt.

Nevertheless, one might venture the suggestion that most of the goals of the student movement have significance for the undergraduate library, some of them quite positive. The call for a greater emphasis on teaching instead of research surely portends a more important role for the undergraduate library. The demand for a share in the power governing the university, as it becomes more sophisticated, may undermine the enormous influence of the graduate departments. This, too, should mean that more attention would be paid to the undergraduate program. The hostility toward bureaucracy in the university may stimulate the library to de-emphasize its own bureaucratic tendencies.[10] Surely these are goals we should support.

The Undergraduate Curriculum

The standard curriculum.--The familiar elements of the undergraduate curriculum--skills courses, distribution requirements, and major requirements, are common to most universities,[11] and have remained substantially the same for a good many years. A recent study, based on a comparison between descriptions of undergraduate programs in catalogs of 1957 compared with those of 1967, concludes:

> Despite all the talk about innovation, undergraduate curricular requirements, as a whole, have changed remarkably little in ten years. In many cases, the most that could be said of a particular institution was that its curriculum has been renovated--that is, requirements were restated in terms of new patterns of organization

> and course offerings and updated to recognize the rights of newer disciplines to a place in the sun. One suspects that, in some cases, this latter consideration rather than a real concern for flexibility may have motivated a move from specific course or discipline requirements to broader distribution requirements. In many cases, the minor changes in requirements, amounting to no more than a reshuffling of credits, can only be characterized as tinkering, although one can imagine faculties spending many hours on these pointless decisions.[12]

There has been a marked increase in the number of institutions which report opportunities for individualization in the curriculum,

> Almost one-half or more of the institutions provide advanced placement (85 percent), honors programs (66 percent), independent study (58 percent), seminars (51 percent), and study abroad programs (47 percent). This represents at least twice the number of colleges and universities making these provisions ten years ago.[13]

But since the study does not differentiate between four-year colleges and universities, we do not know how many of the large universities, about 20 percent of the sample, have followed the trend. More important, we have no indication as to the number of students in any of the institutions who can and do take advantage of these opportunities. In the universities we are concerned with here, enrollments are so large that it seems unlikely that any sizable proportion of the undergraduate student body would be involved in such individualized activities.

Thus we are back with the "standard" undergraduate curriculum which is designed to provide first, the general liberal education--with the breadth and depth needed by the "educated man,"--second, preparation for citizenship, or more broadly, effective participation in society, and third, training for a job or for admission to advanced professional

training. (An additional purpose not proclaimed but real enough, is that of serving as a screening stage through which young people are sorted out into various social and occupational classes.)

Although the ideal of the "educated man" or the cultivated man persists, the time is long past, if there ever was such a time, when there was any real consensus as to what basic knowledge he should have. Some still stress the high culture of western civilization. Others are more concerned with introducing the student to the major problems of our own time. Some want him to acquire the communication and intellectual habits and skills he will need to continue in a life-long learning process. And still others are eclectic, content that if enough hours of breadth and enough hours of depth are required, he will emerge as a reasonable facsimile of the ideal.

As a deliberately pluralistic policy, there would be nothing intrinsically wrong with having the curriculum serve all of these ends, but in most universities the pluralism comes by default, partly as a result of compromise among differing views about the purpose of undergraduate education but mostly through a trade-off process among the departments of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Disciplinary orientation.--Normally the undergraduate curriculum (except in undergraduate professional programs such as business, education, and engineering) is staffed by faculty from this College, each department contributing teachers for the undergraduate offerings in its

own discipline. As a group, these teachers have no organizational autonomy nor even identity as an undergraduate faculty. Each is subject to the pressures within his own department--for promotion, tenure, and recognition--to identify with its discipline and particularly with its aspirations for prestige in the graduate school.

This identification feeds the natural tendency of the instructor to regard his undergraduate courses as the foundation for advanced work in the discipline where "real" education begins, rather than as a part of a program of general, liberal education. Often he treats these courses as screening mechanisms, as if they were designed primarily to identify and recruit the most promising candidates for admission to his own graduate field and to weed out those whose aspirations exceed their academic ability. As long as successful completion of an undergraduate major is a qualification for admission to the graduate program in a discipline, this tendency is almost inevitable. But the same major is also expected to provide the "experience in depth" which theory holds to be an essential part of a liberal education, and the introductory courses required for a major in a given discipline are, more often than not, also made distribution requirements for other disciplines and for pre-professional and professional curricula.

In short, any one undergraduate course may be expected to serve three functions: 1) as a contribution to the breadth of knowledge that every educated person should have; 2) as an experience in depth that is

thought to be an essential component in a liberal education; and 3) as one of a series of certifying steps through which the student must demonstrate his capacity to move up the career ladder into the ranks of those who are qualified to prepare for a place in the "profession" of the discipline. In actuality, the third function is almost always paramount because of the lack of a clear and persuasive rationale for the place of any given course in either the "breadth" or "depth" dimension of liberal education while the certification function is recognizably compatible with the prevailing trend toward professionalization of the disciplines. Furthermore, in the usual organizational structure of the university, the first two functions are "service" functions--services provided by the College of Arts and Sciences to the rest of the university--while only the third is truly "professional." Instructors who teach only undergraduate courses are in a position somewhat comparable to that of librarians who also provide a service function for the teaching faculty.

The University as an Organization

Power and academic goals.--In the summary of her study of six undergraduate libraries, Braden indicates that establishment of a separate undergraduate library is probably not justified unless "graduate students constitute one-third to one-half of the student body" and until "a collection reaches a million volumes."[13] The significance of these two

factors in determining the characteristics of the specific kind of university we are concerned with here is illuminated by a recent study of the relationship between the power structure of the university and its goals.[14] Although there is a general similarity in the power structure of all American universities, the authors found important differences related to a) "graduate emphasis," measured on the basis of the proportion of graduate students,[15] and b) "prestige," for which one measure was number of volumes in the library.[16]

A major conclusion of the study is that power of external forces (funding agencies, alumni, legislatures, and citizens) as compared with that of internal elements (administrative officers, deans, department chairmen, and faculty) is associated with a "service" versus an "elitist" goal orientation.

> At universities whose library holdings are large, the power of the dean of liberal arts, chairmen of departments, and faculty members is considerable. This finding probably reflects the scholarly orientation of these three power-holders and of their consequent demand for good library facilities.
>
> The graduate emphasis of a university is also related to its power structure. As the proportion of graduate students increases, so does the rated power of private agencies. The power of legislators and of the state government, on the other hand, tends to decline, at state universities as well as private ones (where, of course, these groups have little power to begin with). Moreover, the faculty tends to have more power, relative to other groups, and citizens of the state, less power.[18]

The authors report on the goal orientations of "these three power-holders" as follows:

> The goals associated with a powerful dean of liberal arts . . . are the scholarly and elitist goals as opposed to practical and somewhat

anti-intellectual goals. The student's intellect, objectivity, knowledgability about great ideas, and scholarly skills are cultivated, pure research is exalted over applied research. . . Admissions policies are selective, graduate work is encouraged at the expense of emphasis on undergraduate instruction (which invariably ranks in the bottom third of goals (Italics supplied.)

At institutions where chairmen as a group are perceived as having considerable say in decision-making, the goal structure resembles that of universities where deans of liberal arts or of professional schools are powerful. . . . The findings for chairmen resemble even more closely the findings for faculty--not surprisingly since chairmen usually regard themselves, and are regarded, as faculty members.

The findings for faculty resemble the findings for chairmen, and . . . these in turn are very similar to the findings for deans of liberal arts and of professional schools. . . . The goals pursued are essentially the same. . . . At universities where the faculty has considerable power (relative to their power at other universities), low priority is very definitely assigned to such goals as producing a well-rounded student, providing him with the skills and experiences that will facilitate upward mobility, cultivating his taste, and preparing him for citizenship. Similarly, certain support goals are subordinated. Keeping harmony and emphasizing undergraduate instruction are invariably ranked in the bottom third of goals.[19] (Italics supplied.)

In their summary, the authors indicate that the administrators and faculty in all kinds of universities, not just the elite, give high priority to the goal of "training students for scholarship, research, and creative endeavour" and that emphasis on undergraduate instruction ranks very low as an actual ("perceived") and as a desired ("preferred") goal.[20] However, it is the fact that in the elite universities deans, department chairmen, and faculty have a greater share of the power that gives their goal orientation particular significance for our purposes here.

> These universities ranking high on any of these measures [research productivity, prestige, or graduate emphasis] manifest an elitist pattern of perceived goals: They emphasize developing the student' s intellective and scholarly qualities; they carry on pure research; they see themselves as centers for disseminating ideas

> and preserving the cultural heritage. With respect to support goals, they stress those aimed at satisfying the desires and needs of the faculty, they tend to slight undergraduate instruction but to encourage graduate work, and they demonstrate a concern for position goals having to do with the top quality of the academic program and with prestige.[21] (Italics supplied.)

Organizational structure.--Recognizing the fact that those who hold power in the university are fairly unanimous in giving a low priority to undergraduate education (and presumably, to the undergraduate library which serves it) we may still find it useful to understand the structure through which that power operates. It should be obvious, in the first place, that the line authority on the university's organization chart--from the board of trustees through the president, vice-presidents, deans and department chairmen to the individual faculty member--is much less commanding than it appears on paper. Boards, in general, carry a large share of responsibility for raising money; they exercise perfunctory control of the budget and over high-level promotions and tenure appointments. On whatever other matters the president brings before them, the trustees usually function in a supportive fashion.[23] The power of the president to determine what is brought before them is also less significant than one might think, for the faculty, particularly the local faculty "politicians," have various formal and informal avenues for seeing to it that their views are presented. The president preferring to avoid confrontation at the board level, rarely makes proposals which a powerful segment of the faculty opposes.

Within the university the president's power is limited because he is

subject to a great many diverse pressures both from lower echelon administrative officers and from the faculty oligarchy which controls the advisory faculty bodies.[24] These appear on the organization chart as a hierarchy of departmental committees, college councils, graduate councils, topped by the faculty senate. Despite their "advisory" label, the power of these bodies is clearly evidenced in the caution with which the wise administrative officer approaches them with reports and proposals and in their readiness to insist upon a veto power over any proposal for which the remotest claim can be made that it has "educational" implications.

And yet these official faculty bodies have little effectiveness in a positive direction because they reflect the competition among the departments within the university. For the most important power base within the university is the department or, as we would infer from the study of goals, the graduate component of the department. There are, of course, external limits on its power: the total amount of funding for research available from foundations and the government, occasional pressures from legislatures, alumni, and so on. The major limitation, however, is not external at all, but internal. It consists of the competition <u>among</u> graduate departments within the university each vying for <u>its</u> share of the budget, <u>its</u> voice in determining admissions qualifications, grading policies, graduation requirements, and recognition of <u>its</u> discipline in "distribution" or general education requirements in the curriculum.[25]

Within the outer limits set by this inter-departmental competition for funds and for a voice in general policy-making, each department has almost unchallenged control of faculty appointments, tenure and promotion.[26] Through its power to determine requirements for admission to its graduate program, it exerts substantial control over the undergraduate curriculum within the university of which it is a part. Furthermore, depending on its national eminence, it may have considerable influence on the undergraduate programs of all those universities and colleges which aspire to that measure of excellence which depends on the number of graduates who are accepted by prestigious graduate schools.

Whether as cause or effect, this concentration of significant power in the graduate departments is paralleled in the university at large by fragmentation of power over non-curricular, non-academic matters. There are checks and balances in the general administrative structure as there are in that of any complex bureaucracy where the autonomy of each administrative division is limited by the necessity for coordination with others.

The "professionally-oriented" organization.--But the dispersion of effective power among the segments of the university bureaucracy is greater than one finds in other complex organizations of comparable size, such as a corporation or a government agency. One reason for this is that the university falls into the category of organization

the sociologists call the "professionally-oriented." In such an organization the sole purpose of the administration is to expedite what the professionals consider the real work of the organization, that which occurs only in the interrelationship between the professional and his clients or, in the university, between the professor and his students. From the viewpoint of the professional, the ideal administrative machinery is one which works economically, efficiently, and as unobtrusively as possible and, for the professor in the university, the library is part of that administration.

Universities are like hospitals in this respect, but they have added stress arising from the fact that the expertise of the professor--at least as teacher--is not so esoteric, not so far beyond a layman's claim to comprehension and competence--and in the professional realm of the university, administrators, again including librarians, are laymen.

In the hospital, the doctor's claim to an authoritative role vis à vis the hospital administration is largely unchallenged; in the university, the professor's claim to authority, by virtue of his knowledge in a specific subject discipline, is similarly unchallenged and probably unchallengable at the graduate and research level. At the undergraduate level it is challenged, but the challenge is weak, because, as we have seen, in the organizational structure of the university power is generally fragmented and diffused. Neither the administrative hierarchy nor any

organized body of the faculty has so far had what it takes to break through the stalemate of indifference created by competition among graduate departments.

But there is hope for change. Not just educationists, but many eminent scholars have long been seriously concerned about the decreasing attention paid to, and the decline in prestige of, teaching, particularly undergraduate teaching. The student protest movement, from Berkeley on, has made it clear that this concern is justified, but more important, in its very excess, it has produced general awareness of the consequences of the trend toward the multiversity. It has forced both administrators and faculty to undertake serious programs of self-examination and reform.[27] (The excesses of the student movement have also, of course, created a public awareness which can easily backfire, as, for example, when a cut in legislative appropriations results in an even more mass approach to undergraduate teaching.)

The Undergraduate Library and the Library System

Organizational characteristics.--The undergraduate library exists as one component in a total university library system. The function of that system in supporting research is immediately recognizable and easily demonstrated which means that inevitably it responds more readily to the demands of the research-oriented establishment than to the weak requirements of the undergraduate program. It shares with the central admini-

stration of the university the problem of balancing off the conflicting claims among the research needs of the various departments and professional schools. The undergraduate library, like the undergraduate program as a whole, is scarcely even a contender in this battle.

In contrast with the university administration, however, the university library, as an organization in itself, is not professionally-oriented.[28] Its organization reflects the actual distribution of power, authority and responsibility. This comment is not meant to suggest that the university library system is necessarily or even characteristically administered in an authoritative fashion. It does mean that in library organization--usually for very good reason--there is nothing comparable to the tradition and expectation of decentralized authority or departmental autonomy that one finds in the university organization as a whole.

Moreover, although the undergraduate library may not be far down the hierarchy on the organization chart, the control from above is not nominal but real. Furthermore, its staff is usually not very high in the pecking order. Undergraduate librarians are generalists in a situation which rewards administrators and specialists. They aspire to a teaching role in a community where it is assumed that anybody can teach if he knows his subject. And finally, they are removed from contact with the subject department which, as indicated above, is the major power base of the university.

Undergraduate library objectives.--In contrast with the crucial value of the library to the research programs of the university, the library needs of the undergraduate program are less clear-cut, less manifest, less obviously essential. Such "objectives" as those identified in Braden's study of six undergraduate libraries are not particularly helpful for the purpose of elucidating any unique function.[29] Most of them are really antidotes to the ills of the large research library--comfortable and attractive quarters and furnishings (in contrast to the scholar's cluttered office or the graduate student's cramped carrel in the stacks), a collection of books carefully selected to fit a liberal, undergraduate program (in contrast to the comprehensive collection of the university), open access to the stacks (in contrast to the labyrinth, whether open or closed stacks, of the main library), centralization (instead of scattering) of materials, simplification (instead of complexity) of bibliographical access.

One of the objectives "To provide services additional to those given in the research library" seems to have resulted in the fact that the undergraduate library sometimes becomes a catch-all for all sorts of special collections and services in the areas of music, art, poetry and so forth. Often these materials and services are unrelated to any curriculum--least of all the undergraduate--but they represent an acknowledgement of cultural enrichment as a general objective of a liberal, undergraduate curriculum and, conveniently, a simultaneous effort to

provide for some of the cultural interests of the university community as a whole. One objective listed by Braden is of particular concern in this discussion. It is this: "To attempt to make the library an instructional tool by planning it as a center for instruction in library use to prepare undergraduates for using larger collections." There is little or no solid evidence on the extent to which this objective has been attained. Clearly undergraduate librarians, themselves, are not satisfied with what they have been able to achieve in this area. My major purpose in this paper, of course, is to explain some of the obstacles they face with the hope that a clear understanding of the problems will lead to more effective methods of dealing with them.

Operational problems.--Turning from stated objectives to the concrete library needs implied by the character of the undergraduate program, we immediately encounter some of the operational difficulties the undergraduate library faces as part of the university library system. Operationally the university library system is geared toward the scholar's approach to the use of materials. This pattern is partly the result of tradition but it is also in accord with the general research emphasis of a university as a whole. In it the whole organization of library services and bibliographical organization is designed to retrieve for the individual scholar the precise, the unique item he requires. Almost always, as librarians work, they have a mental image of this scholar who will one day need this book, this journal, this bit of information; and all their

efforts are bent toward preparing the machinery--including their own knowledge, their own memory store--in such a way that they can extract the single book, the exact issues of a journal, the specific item of information from the vast storehouse which the library is.

The contrasts with the library needs of the undergraduate program are fairly obvious. First, undergraduate library service is a mass service; what the undergraduate needs is not the unique item but enough copies of the required readings.[30] Furthermore, the deadlines of the undergraduate student, unlike those of the scholar, are imposed and relatively inflexible; the penalities he faces if he cannot get what he needs when he needs it are very severe.

Second, where variation or choice of reading is permitted, many of the books and journals he can use for a given assignment are virtually interchangeable; he does not require the meticulous bibliographical description which is required to identify each item's uniqueness for the scholar's retrieval.

Third, the "content" of what the undergraduate is expected to learn can come from his teacher, his textbook, or other print and non-print sources--including library materials. It is not clear what these other sources add to the teacher-textbook content nor have we as yet identified with any precision what the library is uniquely or even especially well-prepared to supply. As a specific example, even the term paper, which is the common "individual" assignment in the under-

graduate curriculum, is often based on sources which the student somehow ran across while skimming through current magazines or while browsing the paperback racks in the bookstore, or on items suggested by the instructor, by a classmate or by the textbook itself. My frequent personal impression, in fact, is that the better term paper is the product not of an orderly library search but of a marriage between an inquiring, imaginative student mind and sheer serendipity as to sources.

In short, the operational requirements of the undergraduate library are seriously at odds with those of the parent university library system. Many policies and procedures are diametrically opposed to the sort of fine tuning between supply and demand which characterizes the operation of a well-run supermarket--which is the appropriate model for the undergraduate library. We are reluctant to buy duplicate to meet immediate demands, wanting to be assured ahead of time that the demand will be sustained. We jealously guard current issues of periodicals, being inclined to send them off to the bindery at precisely the time their usefulness is greatest, because we want to be sure that we have unbroken back files. We rely on a centralized processing department, one in which meticulous bibliographic verification and description of every item must fit the exacting requirements of the scholar, without regard to the cost to the student of the resulting time lag in making materials available.

Advantages and opportunities.--In this section attention so far

has been directed exclusively to the negative aspects of the undergraduate library's position in the university library system. The advantages are more obvious: 1) the university library system provides a back-up of resources and services which are avilable to the undergraduate student so that he is not dependent on the undergraduate library for all his library needs; 2) the undergraduate library collection is likely to be far better than any college library collection of comparable size, because the university can involve a considerably greater range of subject specialists in the process of selection and because, again, the back-up function of the university library reduces the risk which might accrue to a too narrow definition of what is properly "undergraduate;" and 3) a separate undergraduate library building increases the ability of the library administration to resist encroachment on the part of faculty, administrators, departments, and departmental libraries, all of which are always hungry for space.

It is clear, nevertheless, that the undergraduate library has difficulty making the most of its superior collection and physical facilities partly because of its disadvantageous position in the university library system. In its attempt to take on a teaching function it is particularly handicapped, especially in comparison with most four-year college libraries, because it is faced with a massive student body.

Among the trends which might help to remedy this situation are the following:

1. A call in academic circles for a decentralization of decision-making,[31]

2. The appearance of a similar sentiment in library literature, at least, and perhaps in practice.[32]

3. Actual decentralization of the undergraduate program in the form of cluster colleges (Santa Cruz and San Diego) and colleges-within-the-university (Monteith at Wayne State, Charter College at Oakland, Justin Morrill at Michigan State, and the residential college at Michigan).

It must be emphasized that this latter development, the establishment of new colleges within the university, will have no impact on library service to undergraduates unless the university library (or the undergraduate library) makes a point of capitalizing on the opportunity that almost any new program affords. It was disappointing to learn, for example, that the separate college libraries at Santa Cruz are not really libraries at all but reading rooms, that they get neither funds nor staff from the central library. Similarly, it was discouraging to hear that because the new residential colleges at Michigan had no library of its own--the students use the Undergraduate Library--the possibility of developing a library program for that college was not even seriously considered.

Conclusion

Perspectives on the undergraduate library.--Before moving on to a proper set of conclusions and recommendations, let me propose four different general perspectives on the undergraduate library:

1. The undergraduate library is, almost by definition, a phenomenon of the large, research-oriented university. Increase in research activities and in graduate and professional school enrollment produces enormously increased demands on the university library for research materials and services. As a result the space, the collection, and the services needed for the undergraduate program are simply crowded out. The undergraduate student is, in effect, a displaced person and the undergraduate library is a compensatory measure taken on his behalf. It offers him an efficient and reasonably comfortable refugee camp.

This view, one which might be dubbed "the radical perspective," sees the undergraduate library as essentially one of the symptoms of the ills of the multiversity "system" and of the "sick society" which supports it. Presented in the fashionable heightened "rhetoric" of the dissidents, the picture is both distorted and over-simplified but it has, I think, enough reality in it to make us all uncomfortable.

2. The reality in the "instrumental" perspective is more easily perceived and much more comfortable to live with. Its language is usually statistical and the view it presents, usually in annual reports, is one of ever-increasing attendance and circulation, longer and longer hours of service, more and more reference questions and so on. The philosophy behind this perspective is well expressed in a statement about the Undergraduate Library of the University of Michigan:

> But for libraries like the UGL, demand can be calculated according to numbers of readers. Given that simplification, the rest follows: The UGL collection is comparatively select because it was created to serve a comparatively select group of readers. The UGL is free to concentrate on problems of number simply because problems of value are relegated to other members of the University community--those who set admission standards, or establish curricula, or determine reading requirements. The UGL is, in short, more clearly instrumental than any other library at the University, and quantifiable standards of efficiency can be more meaningfully applied to it than to any other. The point is worth laboring because both universities and libraries are often called upon to justify operations in terms of working efficiency. The UGL is almost a test case, suggesting that educators and librarians can work with factory-like efficiency, when and if they believe the case is one which safely allows for concentration on numbers.[33]

3. A third view one might call the "aristocratic" perspective.

In this view the undergraduate library provides an environment, materials and services appropriate for general, liberal education, that fundamental learning which marks the "cultivated" man, whatever his professional or social role may be. The reality in this perspective is symbolized by the art galleries, the record collections, the poetry rooms, and so on, which are proudly described as "special services" of the undergraduate library. It is implied in the particular attention given to the physical appearance of the undergraduate library, the preference for carpeting "Because it is quiet and induces an aura of graciousness,"[34] and the provision of attractive lounge areas (although these are often reduced in size or even removed altogether as demand for seating space increases). But most of all it is attested to in book collection policy statements:

> The collection of the Lamont Library at Harvard would "attempt to reach beyond the curriculum to provide a selection of the best

writings of all times and peoples.[35]

> The collection of the Uris Library at Cornell would contain "the best of those books which in the judgment of the university faculty are requisite to create a thoroughly informed and cultured modern person.[36]

> The Undergraduate Library at the University of Texas "was thought of as an enlarged 'gentleman's library' with books in the arts, letters, and sciences aimed at the level of the layman. Emphasis is on fine biography and history, contemporary belles lettres, literary criticism and reliable interpretation of science for the non-scientist.[37]

4. The fourth perspective stresses a teaching role for the undergraduate library. Statements on the purpose of the undergraduate library often indicate that the undergraduate student can here, with a smaller and selective collection and a less complex and cumbersome bibliographic apparatus, develop the skills which will enable him later to use the larger and more complicated scholarly library effectively. Some doubters question this ready assumption of transfer of training,[38] however, and there is no research evidence on the point. But in addition, some of these statements use phrases like "instructional tool" or "learning workshops" which suggest something more than or different from mere retrieval skills, that is, the ability to locate books and articles and information.

Presumably that "something more" occurs to some extent in the teaching emphasis in undergraduate library reference service, about which we are to hear more later. But the phrases suggest, also, a more general and total involvement in undergraduate education, a role which is well-described in the terms "active service capability" and "the

concept of librarian as teacher," which were used in the proposal for this Institute.

Each of these four views offers a different picture of the present state and future prospects of the undergraduate library. From the radical perspective, the undergraduate library symbolizes the system which must be turned around, if not overturned, in the interests of a just and humane society. From the instrumental perspective, the undergraduate library is a product of the same managerial competence and efficiency which has managed to provide abundance and affluence for an astonishing proportion of the American people--despite an ever-increasing population and ever-rising expectations. From the aristocratic perspective, the undergraduate library is the embodiment of the threatened but still vital ideal of a liberal, civilizing education. And from the teaching perspective the undergraduate library epitomizes the fundamental concern of the educator with the process of learning.

The teaching perspective is probably the least realistic of the four suggested. But it is also the most challenging. So let us take up the challenge.

Summary and recommendations.--In order to work toward the ideal of the undergraduate library as a teaching instrument, we must begin by developing as clear as possible an understanding of these elements of the academic world which will inevitably play an important part in the outcome of our efforts and by determining to use this understanding as

a positive contribution to the development of an active campaign to achieve our goal. Specifically, with respect to the faculty:

1. The trend toward professionalization of the disciplines brings along with it a sense of identification with the disciplinary peer group and a corresponding distrust of--and some degree of immunity to--the local administrative hierarchy. We should not attempt to achieve our objectives by way of administrative fiat, but we should use whatever administrative support we can get in seeking access to the faculty. In addition, we should de-emphasize the bureaucratic style of library operations as much as we safely can.

2. Faculty members are sincerely concerned about their teaching effectivness and, at the moment, they are feeling guilty because they are under attack for alleged neglect of their teaching duties. We should do our best to capitalize on this situation by making it known, in an aggressive but diplomatic way, that the library and its staff have both the willingness and the capacity to help. We should also support, in any way we can, the efforts of those faculty members who attempt to achieve a redress of the balance between teaching and research on the campus.

3. Most faculty members know little about learning theory or instructional methodology but their attitude toward these matters is usually one of indifference or contempt. This means that librarians who are knowledgeable in these areas have an important contribution to make but that they must be extremely circumspect in making it.

4. Faculty members, quite rightly, regard use of the library as a means toward the achievement of their own teaching objectives. We must, therefore, guard against our own tendency to view library use or skill in library use as ends in themselves. (Those who regard, as I do, the ability to use the library effectively, like the ability to write effectively, as one of the attributes of the liberally educated man, must discretely propose this objective as a rather nice bonus that the student can collect incidentally as he strives to attain the instructor's course objectives.)

5. The faculty has limited understanding of the intellectual processes involved in sophisticated library competence. We must avoid technical, high schoolish programs of instruction in use of the library, developing and using, instead, individual self-teaching devices to convey such how-to-do-it skills to those students who need them, when they need them. Since we are far from secure in our own understanding of the intellectual processes in library use, we must also strive to overcome this weakness by attempting constantly to identify and make explicit these processes in our own work.

6. The potential for active collaboration between the library and the faculty varies from discipline to discipline as well as from individual to individual. We must, therefore, be alert to the possibilities at both levels, deliberately cultivating the faculty in departments whose fields seem promising and at the same time making the most of

every contact with any library-minded professor.

With respect to students:

1. The single most important influence on the student's academic behavior is the GPA perspective. In order to get the highest payoff for our effort to increase the library's contribution to the educational program, therefore, we must work primarily with and through the faculty.

2. An important item on the agenda of the student activists, at least of the moderates, is improvement in the quality of undergraduate teaching. We must support these students in this effort. We might, for instance, try to involve the most talented of such students in examining the potential role of the library in excellent teaching and in developing plans to see that this potential is realized.

3. The student sub-culture which has been labelled "nonconformist" combines intellectual interests with a rejection of institutional pressures toward the GPA perspective. We should, therefore, explore ways of working directly with students in this category, if possible involving them in plans for making available library activities, materials, and services which meet their interests.

With respect to the undergraduate curriculum:

1. The most serious obstacle to the development of a coherent and effective undergraduate curriculum for general, liberal education is the power of the competing graduate programs in the disciplines

and of the "credentialism" which accompanies it. We must support the efforts of those who recognize this phenomenon and oppose it, participating formally, if possible, informally, if not, in any campus activities concerned with curriculum study and reform.

2. Another serious obstacle stems from the fact that the undergraduate teaching staff has no identity as such, no claim to autonomy in its work. We should, therefore, make the most of any exceptions to this general rule, establishing relationships with, proposing library programs for, whatever councils, separate colleges, or other administrative entities there may be.

With respect to the university as an organization:

1. The power structure and goal orientation characteristic of the type of university in which the undergraduate library is likely to occur produce an environment which is hostile to emphasis on undergraduate instruction, as such, but highly favorable to objectives having to do with developing students' intellectual and scholarly skills. In making the case for use of the undergraduate library, therefore, we should stress its relevance to intellectual and scholarly work rather than to undergraduate education or the undergraduate curriculum.

2. The university is a professionally-oriented complex organization. Understanding the characteristics of this type, we should be neither surprised nor disturbed to recognize that the teaching faculty regard the library as having a "service" function, as playing a supportive,

subsidiary part in the educational program. What is important is not the label placed on our contribution but that it be significant.

3. Coordination of the tremendous range and variety of library activities necessitates an hierarchical organizational structure for the university library system and a consequent limitation on the autonomy of any individual professional librarian. The resulting disparity between the "academic style" of the professor and the "professional style" of the librarian is an obstacle to the achievement of a colleague relationship. Library policies and procedures, therefore, should be reviewed and revised to the end of giving the individual professional librarian as much authority and responsibility as is practicable without damage to the system as a whole.

With respect to the undergraduate library in the university library system:

1. The university library system is quite naturally and inevitably responsive primarily to the library requirements of the graduate and research programs of the university. This means that an effort to enhance the contribution of the undergraduate library calls for conscious and deliberate measures to: a) identify in a positive way the unique functions of the undergraduate library, b) recruit and/or train librarians for the undergraduate library staff who have the particular qualifications which would enable them to collaborate actively with the teaching faculty (e.g., a commitment to the teaching enterprise,

a broad liberal arts background of high quality, and thorough understanding of curriculum design, learning theory, and instructional methods), and c) make certain that this staff has access to the faculty, that it is involved in all levels of planning.

2. Operations in the university library system are designed to serve the needs and the style of the individual scholar. To the extent that the undergraduate library is obliged to follow this operational pattern, its efficiency in providing necessary mass service may be severely limited. We must develop ways of rationalizing mass library service to undergraduates in cost-efficiency terms, but in doing so we must build into our calculations: a) a better understanding of the differences between the "approach" requirements of the individual and the large group; b) an acceptance of the idea that most of the materials used in undergraduate education are not rare or irreplaceable but expendable--the more they are used up in the learning process the better; and c) recognition of the fact that student time is a crucial element in the cost part of our equations.[39]

3. The inescapable necessity for mass service in the undergraduate library underlines the validity of what I have called "the instrumental perspective" to such an extent that it threatens to swamp any other view. We must, therefore, distinguish carefully between mass service and the other legitimate undergraduate library functions, make mass service as efficient and economical as possible, and use whatever savings there may be to support these other functions.

None of the recommendations presented above offer much in the way of concrete, practical actions that can be put into effect immediately. But for library administrators and undergraduate librarians who are truly committed to the teaching perspective, they may serve as a useful long-range set of "guidelines for bucking the system."

Patricia B. Knapp
July, 1970

Footnotes

1. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1968).

2. Robert T. Blackburn, "College Libraries--Indicted Failures: Some Reasons--and a Possible Remedy," College and Research Libraries, XXIX (March, 1968), 171-177.

3. Daniel Bell uses the terms "sequential" (natural science), "concentric" (humanities), and "linkage" (social sciences) to describe a parallel distinction among these fields as to the stages of learning they involve. See his The Reforming of General Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).

4. The faculty in art and music, unless they are working on historical aspects, are at the other end of this scale. They usually know little about the library or even about the literature of their own field. In my experience, however, they are often reluctant to cooperate with the library because they have so often encountered librarians who tend to recommend biography and criticism to the student when the instructor wants him to experience the work of art directly and personally.

5. Rebecca S. Vreeland and Charles E. Bidwell, "Classifying University Departments: an Approach to the Analysis of Their Effects upon Undergraduates' Values and Attitudes," Sociology of Education, XXIX (Summer, 1966) 237-254, cited by Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore M. Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969), I, 172.

6. Ibid., p. 186.

7. Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, and Everett C. Hughes, Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 133.

8. Ibid., p. 134.

9. Burton R. Clark and Martin Trow, "The Organizational Context" in College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research, edited

by T. M. Newcomb and E. K. Wilson, cited by Feldman and Newcomb, op. cit., pp. 232-33. (Note, however, that this study was first reported on in 1960.)

10. In the mass efficiency of its operations, the undergraduate library is really a symptom of the system that the students are rebelling against, but they have most not yet recognized it as such. We might conclude, therefore, that the undergraduate library should just keep quiet. As one of Braden's guidelines puts it, "Let use of the library develop according to the character of the student body. Do not try to enforce any stringent rules." Irene A. Braden, The Undergraduate Library (Chicago: American Library Association), p. 150.

11. "The sameness of the undergraduate curriculum among colleges belies the pluralism which is foremost among the official virtues of the system. The pervasiveness of standard curricular patterns is ample evidence that the processes generating them inhere in the institutional system rather than in each faculty. As well might a common snail imagine it had chosen the pattern on its shell, which is, of course, generic to its kind." Phillip C. Ritterbush, "Adaptive Response within the Institutional System of Higher Education and Research," Daedalus, XCIX (Summer, 1970) 656.

12. Paul L. Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle, Undergraduate Curriculum Trends (Chicago: American Council on Education , 1969), p. 75.

13. Ibid., p. 44.

14. Braden, op. cit., p. 148.

15. Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power (Washington: American Council on Education, 1968).

16. Ibid., p. 56.

17. Ibid., p. 61.

18. Ibid., p. 114-15.

19. Ibid., pp. 89-96, passim.

20. Ibid., p. 109.

21. Ibid., p. 111.

23. In times of trouble and particularly in state institutions, this is often not the case. Clark Kerr remarks: "In the case of the University of California, when the trustees and regents were not under pressure, they thought that they were representing the University. When they were under pressure, a lot of them decided they were representing the public." "Governance of the Universities" Daedalus, XCVIII (Fall, 1969), 1104.

24. That this faculty control is oligarchic rather than general is demonstrated in a recent study by T. R. McConnell. His evidence shows that only about ten percent of the faculty are involved in faculty governance. T. R. McConnell, "Campus Governance--Faculty Participation," The Research Reporter, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, V, No. 1 (1970). The relationship between this locally powerful faculty oligarchy and strength of the graduate and professional disciplines, which are oriented in a more cosmopolitan direction, is an interesting question on which I have seen no evidence.

25. "Faculty interest in undergraduate teaching has been static by comparison with specialization and social involvement. Our failure to develop a more coherent and educationally effective curriculum reflects the inertia of departmental structure and faculty avoidance of wider perspectives in undergraduate teaching. . . . If members of faculties realized that curricula were not really their own corporate creation but lower order resultants of accommodation among departments they might insist upon improvements which would come to reflect their peculiar strengths and widely shared interests." Ritterbush, op. cit., p. 656.

26. Two young graduates of the University of Michigan provide the viewpoint of the student: "The department is a versatile organism. It is a curator of the latest research terminology. It is also a very primitive social system offering an impregnable territorial defense against outsiders, whether they be politicians, administrators, or undergraduates; internally, the department functions as effectively as a Mafia family. The young are kept under control by tight reward-and-sanction mechanisms, such as grades for undergraduates, doctoral puberty rites for graduate students, and tenure for assistant professors. Likewise, the elders of the tribe have built up a series of conventions that foster nonaggressive

behavior, despite the fact that Marxists and capitalists may share the same cubicle. For example, personal property such as courses and research, is given sacred sanction; picking on a professor's prized survey course is akin to violating his wife. In making important decisions, departmental councils (normally comprised of elders only) operate on a principle of consensus, whereby the minority never argues so harshly that it can't recant and defer to the majority. In personnel matters, a good department works like a jury to reach unanimity." Roger Rapoport and Laurence J. Kirshbaum, Is the Library Burning? (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 52-53.

27. In addition to the sources cited elsewhere in this paper, these titles are particularly recommended: "The Embattled University," Daedalus XCIX (Winter, 1970); Calvin Lee (ed.), Improving College Teaching (Washington: American Council on Education); Joseph J. Schwab, College Curriculum and Student Protest (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969); Robert Paul Wolff, "The Ideal of the University," Change, I (September-October, 1969), 48-72.

28. Library organization, in general, follows the pattern described by Etzioni as characteristic of what he calls the "semi-professions." It is hierarchial and bureaucratic, like that of the business corporation or the army, but in the semi-professions, the top administrators are members of the profession who have climbed the career ladder into the administrative class. Though their duties may be far removed from actual practice of their profession, these administrators are still identified with it. Cf. Amitai Etzioni, The Semi-Professions and Their Organization: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers (New York: Free Press, 1969). In contrast, although university presidents are usually (but not always) former professors and deans and department chairmen invariably are, these positions (except for the presidency) are not regarded in academic circles as the upper rungs in the career ladder of the professoriate. Rather, the man who accepts any administrative position higher than department chairman is seen as one who has left, not to say deserted, his profession.

29. Braden, op. cit., p. 137.

30. Braden refers to the goal of the Uris Library at Cornell with respect to duplication, which was stated in the formula "E plus 1, meaning "enough plus one." Ibid., p. 37. If literally applied,

this formula would mean that there would never be a time when there was not one copy remaining on the shelf after all student needs had been satisfied. How many undergraduate libraries even dream of such a happy state?

31. Cf., for example, Feldman and Newcomb, op. cit., pp. 336-338.

32. Cf., for example, Eldred Smith, "Academic Status for College and University Librarians--Problems and Prospects," College and Research Libraries, XXXI (January, 1970), 7-13; John H. Moriarity, "Academic in Deed," College and Research Libraries, XXXI (January, 1970), 14-17.

33. "The Undergraduate Library," Research News, Office of Research Administration, University of Michigan, XV (May, 1965), 4.

34. Braden, Op. cit., p. 140.

35. Ibid., p. 3.

36. Ibid., p. 101

37. Ibid., p. 124.

38. William S. Dix, "Library Service to Undergraduates: Undergraduate Students Do Not Necessarily Require a Special Facility," College and Research Libraries, XVII (March, 1956) 148-50.

39. An excellent beginning to the rationalization of library service, one in which the time of the library user is included as a cost factor, is offered by Phillip M. Morse, Library Effectiveness: A Systems Approach (Cambridge: M. I. T. Press, 1968).